

Serial Number 10/040,311

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Amendments to Specification and Claims

The specification and claims have been amended to correct various minor grammatical and idiomatic errors, including the errors noted in the objections to the claims set forth on page 2 of the Official Action.

The only other change to the claims is that the subject matter of claim 7 has been added to claim 1, and the dependencies of the remaining claims corrected accordingly.

Because the changes to the specification and claims are all formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that they do not involve "new matter."

2. Rejection of Claims 1-8 Under 35 USC §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,860 (Kung)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Kung patent fails to disclose or suggest the feature, originally recited in claim 7 and now recited in claim 1, wherein the website identifier is assigned at least two unique phone codes, and the user is hyperlinked to the website based on *either* of the phone codes.

The Examiner cites col. 5, lines 5-15 of the Kung patent as supporting the recitation of multiple codes per website. However, claim 1 (and original claim 7) specifically recites that either of the "phone codes" will cause a hyperlink to the website. That is not the case with the numbers described in col. 5, lines 5-15 of the Kung patent, which are parts of a single unique phone number (area code, country code, and the like), and which must be combined in order to provide a unique number. In contrast, the claimed phone codes are unique phone codes, each of which might include country code, area code, and justifiable number, as recited in claim 2.

Serial Number 10/040,311

Instead of describing the claimed multiple phone codes, col. 5, lines 5-10 of the Kung patent merely state that *"the register only needs to provide his or her country code, area code, and justifiable telephone number (or assigning a unique number to the one without telephone number) for coding. Therefore the authentication and administration of IP address are simplified, which prevents unnecessary lawsuit."* This passage clearly specifies that the register **only** needs to provide a country code, area code, and telephone number, which make up a single unique phone code. The country code, area code, and "telephone number" of Kung are not themselves unique, but only unique when combined together.

There is no suggestion in the Kung patent of that the country code by itself, the area code by itself, or the justifiable telephone number by itself, will invoke a hyperlink, and thus the Kung patent does not suggest providing **two unique numbers** for a single website. Providing two numbers, each of which can hyperlink to the website, makes it easier for users (since a company may have different local numbers). On the other hand, it likely would complicate administration of the IP address, and therefore would be contrary to the stated objective of simplification disclosed in the Kung patent, which is to ensure that authentication and administration of the IP address are simplified.

It is true that col. 5, lines 11-15 mention *"register's contact phone numbers."* However, this passage does not suggest that each of the contact phone numbers should be coded in order to provide a hyperlink to the website. Instead, the passage simply notes that the registry already includes memory space for contact phone numbers. In other words, col. 5, lines 11-15 of the Kung patent simply note that since the domain name registry already includes space for contact phone numbers, the use of one of the phone numbers as a code will not require extra memory space. This is not the same as a suggestion that two of the contact phone numbers normally associated with a registry should be coded for hyperlinking.

Because the Kung patent neither discloses nor suggests the claimed association of two (or more) unique phone codes with a website, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of

Serial Number 10/040,311

claims 1-8 under 35 USC §102(b) is improper and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of Claims 9-20 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,697,860 (Kung) and 6,792,082 (Levine)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Levine patent, like the Kung patent, fails to disclose or suggest the feature wherein the website identifier is assigned at least *two unique phone codes*, and the user is hyperlinked to the website based on *either* of the phone codes. Instead, the Levine patent is directed to an intelligent contact book.

It is respectfully submitted that the fact that companies might have several telephone numbers is no suggestive of using more than one of those numbers to access a website. The Kung patent does not contemplate using more than one unique telephone code to access a particular website, and since the Levine patent does not concern any sort of website access scheme, it is respectfully submitted that the Levine patent could not possibly have suggested, in the absence of hindsight, modification of the website access scheme of Kung to enable access through different unique telephone codes. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-20 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA  
Registration No. 33,805

Date: February 28, 2005

Serial Number 10/040,311

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

© 2005 by The United States Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20503